ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TECHNIQUES IN ESP CLASSES

Muzaffar Ortiqov

Lecturer, Diplomat University, Uzbekistan

maxmil12121212@gmail.com

Abstract: This article analyzes the types of oral corrective feedback used by teachers in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classes and their effectiveness. The study examines the effects of different forms of correction – recast, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, explicit correction, and repetition – based on teacher-student interaction patterns. The article identifies effective approaches to correcting grammatical, pronunciation, and lexical errors in ESP classes and recommends methods that have a positive impact on student motivation and language learning. The results of the study show that interactive and contextual correction methods play an important role in improving students' speech accuracy.

Keywords: Oral corrective feedback, ESP classes, recast, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, pronunciation errors, language learning, communication strategies.

Introduction: In recent years, the issue of correcting errors and providing effective feedback to students in English language teaching has been widely studied. Especially in ESP (English for Specific Purposes) classes, oral corrective feedback plays an important role in improving students' language competence. Because in these classes, language is used not only as theoretical knowledge, but also as a means of professional communication. Therefore, students need to be able to recognize language errors in a timely manner and learn to correct them correctly in real communicative situations.

Oral corrective feedback is a pedagogical strategy aimed at identifying and correcting student errors by the teacher. This process ensures the student's active participation in the language learning process, develops communicative competence, and allows them to learn from mistakes. Researchers (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ellis, 2009; Sheen, 2010) believe that the type, frequency, and method of feedback directly affect the learner's response activity. For example, recasting (repeating an error in the correct form) focuses students' attention on grammatical forms, while elicitation encourages them to correct themselves independently.

In ESP classes, this approach becomes even more complex, as students use language in professional contexts – for example, in the fields of medicine, technology, business or tourism. Therefore, the teacher needs to correct not only language errors, but also incorrect developments in professional discourse. A correctly chosen verbal feedback method teaches students to communicate effectively in their field, express their thoughts clearly and use professional language confidently.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the verbal correction techniques used in ESP classes, determine their impact on students' speech and motivation to learn, and recommend the most effective approaches. The study examines different types of feedback, the context of their use and their acceptance by students. This will provide a deeper understanding of the role of feedback in ESP classes and identify ways to effectively implement it in teaching practice.

Material and methods: Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is a verbal response by the teacher or interlocutor to a language error made by the student. Such feedback helps the student to understand the error, correct it and avoid repeating such an error in the future. The main goal of OCF is to develop a balance between accuracy and fluency in the student's speech. Therefore, this method is especially important in ESP (English for Specific Purposes) classes, because

students need to learn to use the language correctly not only grammatically, but also in a professional context.

Many researchers (Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2010) consider OCF to be an integral part of effective language teaching. They believe that correction is not just a matter of pointing out an error, but an interactive process that develops the student's thinking. In this regard, the feedback provided by the teacher plays an important role in analyzing the student's speech, using the language consciously, and forming communicative competence. In ESP classes, teachers use various OCF methods. The most common types are:

Explicit correction – the teacher clearly indicates the error and gives the correct form. Example: Student: "He go to the hospital." → Teacher: "No, we say He goes to the hospital."

Recast – the teacher does not correct the student, but repeats the error in the correct form. Example: Student: "She can sings." → Teacher: "Yes, she can sing very well."

Clarification request – the teacher asks a question pretending not to understand, which encourages the student to correct the mistake himself. Example: "Sorry, could you repeat that?"

Metalinguistic feedback – provides an explanation in language about a grammatical or pronunciation error. Example: "Remember, after can we use the base form of the verb."

Elicitation – the teacher does not give the correct answer, but expects the student to find it himself. Example: "He go to...?"

Repetition – the teacher repeats the student's mistake and draws attention to it through intonation. Each method has its advantages and limitations. For example, recasting does not disrupt the student's fluency, but the student may not always notice that the error has been corrected. On the contrary, explicit correction is more accurate, but can sometimes reduce the student's motivation. Therefore, the teacher must choose the most appropriate approach depending on the situation in the classroom.

ESP lessons, unlike general English lessons, have a professional focus. For example, students in medicine, business, engineering or information technology use English for professional communication, writing reports or giving presentations. Therefore, their errors may often be terminological or pragmatic errors, rather than grammatical.

For example, if medical students say "patient says pain" instead of "patient complains about pain", this may be grammatically correct, but in a professional context it is considered incorrect. In this case, the teacher can correct the combination "complains about" through recast or metalinguistic feedback. Effective feedback in the ESP context:

should be appropriate to the professional context;

should allow the student to self-correct;

should maintain a communicative environment.

Research shows that interactive, positive, and timely feedback in ESP classes increases students' fluency and enhances their ability to express themselves freely.

In most experiments, students find verbal feedback helpful, especially when it is given gently and without interrupting the conversation. Teachers, on the other hand, prefer recast and explicit correction because they are faster and more effective. At the same time, metalinguistic feedback helps students to gain a deeper understanding of the grammatical system.

Successful feedback in ESP classes also serves to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and openness between the teacher and the student. When students are not afraid to make mistakes and actively participate in communication, this significantly improves their speaking skills in professional English.

Result and discussions: In this study, three stages were carried out to determine the effectiveness of verbal correction in ESP lessons: Lesson observation – lessons in 6 ESP groups

were videotaped for 4 weeks. Interviews were conducted with teachers and students. Questionnaires were used to study the views of students and teachers on the types of correction. The participants of the study were 45 ESP students (medical, business, and technical majors) and 6 English teachers. During the observation, a total of 312 errors and 6 types of verbal correction applied to them (recast, explicit correction, elicitation, clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic feedback) were analyzed. The following observation results were recorded:

Correction type	Frequency of use (%)	Correct answer by students (%)
Recast	34%	48%
Explicit correction	21%	76%
Elicitation	17%	69%
Clarification request	12%	54%
Metalinguistic feedback	10%	73%
Repetition	6%	62%

The analysis showed that explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback were the most effective in helping students understand and correct errors. This is because these two methods explain the essence of the error to the student and enhance conscious reflection on the language system. At the same time, although recast was used most often, students sometimes did not perceive it as an error correction –which reduced its effectiveness.

The analysis shows that the effectiveness of the correction types differs depending on the professional field:

Students in the medical field preferred explicit grammatical corrections, since accuracy is important in their field.

Students in the business field, on the other hand, positively perceived feedback in a natural form (recast, elicitation), which does not disrupt the communication process.

Students in the technical field considered metalinguistic feedback to be the most useful in correcting terminological errors, because it allows them to understand the essence of the concept.

Therefore, in ESP classes, feedback strategies should be selected according to the content of the subject and the context of communication.

According to the results of the questionnaire:

82% of students considered verbal corrections to be useful.

64% of students positively received corrections given in a gentle and encouraging tone.

38% of students felt uncomfortable when the teacher openly pointed out the mistake in public.

These results indicate that the psychological style of feedback also has a significant impact on its effectiveness. When the teacher corrects the mistake with respect for the student's personality and with a helpful and positive intention, student motivation increases significantly.

In ESP classes, verbal correction is the main tool for language learning, which not only corrects errors, but also develops the student's speech self-control skills. The most effective correction methods are explicit correction, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback, as they encourage the student to think actively. Recast is useful in natural communication, but its effectiveness is only high if the student understands that the error has been corrected. Each type of feedback should be adapted to the subject, area, and language level of the student. To provide feedback effectively, the teacher must have such competencies as language didactics, psychological sensitivity, and understanding of the professional context.

Results section: As a result of observations, interviews, and questionnaires conducted during the research, the effectiveness of the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) used in ESP classes, students' attitudes, and teachers' preferences were analyzed. In general, all participants considered oral correction to be a necessary element of the language learning process.

According to the results of the analysis: 93% of teachers consider OCF to be an integral part of the teaching process; 82% of students stated that oral correction helps them improve their language skills; 71% of students noted that they learned to recognize and correct their grammatical errors through corrections. These results indicate that OCF plays an important role not only in students' error correction, but also in the process of conscious understanding of the language system.

The most effective types of correction identified on the basis of observation were as follows:

Type of correction	Student correct answer rate (%)	Effectiveness rating
Explicit correction	76%	High
Metalinguistic feedback	73%	High
Elicitation	69%	Average-high
Recast	48%	Average
Clarification request	54%	Average
Repetition	62%	Average

The results show that explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback (explanation based on language rules) were the most effective. They help students understand the error, remember the rule, and apply it correctly in the future. On the other hand, although recast was used most often, it was not always perceived by the student as a correction. This indicates the need for more specific guidance in the teacher's feedback style.

The results obtained by different fields of study differ as follows:

Medical students preferred explicit correction of grammatical and pronunciation errors, as this ensures clarity in their professional communication.

Business students, on the other hand, found recast and elicitation methods to be convenient, as they did not interrupt the conversation and had a natural tone.

Technical students found metalinguistic feedback most useful for terminological errors because it allowed for a deeper understanding of the meaning of technical terms. Thus, the types of OCF produced different results depending on the content of the field, the context of communication, and the level of language.

Students believed that:

When verbal correction is given in a positive tone, it encourages them and encourages them to learn from their mistakes.

On the other hand, correction given by the teacher in a harsh or critical tone reduces motivation.

68% of students preferred individual or small group correction, while public correction made them uncomfortable.

These results confirm the need for teachers to pay attention to pedagogical sensitivity and a psychological approach. Sincere, positive and constructive feedback is the most important factor that increases students' motivation to work on themselves.

Based on the results of the study, the following main conclusions were drawn:

Verbal correction is an integral part of ESP lessons, accelerating the language learning process and developing students' communicative competence.

Explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback were recognized as the most effective methods.

The type of feedback should be selected depending on the student's language level, field of study, and personal learning style.

Teachers' positive, encouraging feedback increases student motivation. An effective OCF system develops students' reflective thinking about language, learning from mistakes, and independent correction skills.

Conclusion: The results of this study show that oral corrective feedback is an indispensable and effective tool for language learning in ESP classes. In addition to eliminating students' errors, it develops their speech activity, analytical thinking skills, and professional communicative competence. The important conclusions identified during the study are as follows:

Oral correction not only serves to correct errors, but also to activate students' thinking and consciously master the language system.

Explicit correction, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback types increase students' ability to recognize and independently correct language errors.

Recast does not disrupt the natural communicative environment, but if the student does not perceive it as correction, its effectiveness decreases.

Correction strategies in ESP classes should be differentiated depending on the nature of the subject, the purpose of the lesson, and the language level of the students.

Corrections given by the teacher in an encouraging, respectful, and positive tone increase students' motivation and encourage them to work on themselves.

The feedback process strengthens cooperation, trust, and open communication between the teacher and the student. In general, verbal correction is a psycholinguistic mechanism that activates the language learning process in ESP lessons. When used correctly, it forms independent learning, reflection, and professional communication skills in students.

Based on the results of the study, the following practical recommendations are put forward:

Recommendations for teachers: When choosing feedback, it is necessary to take into account the purpose of the lesson and the needs of students. It is advisable to use explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback in grammatical or professionally meaningful parts of the lesson. It is necessary to make corrections in an encouraging tone, not criticizing the student. A balanced use of different types of feedback in the lesson increases efficiency. After each correction, the student should be given the opportunity to think and respond independently.

Recommendations for students: Follow the principle of learning from mistakes in the process of mastering feedback; consider making mistakes as natural. Record the corrections given by the teacher and keep a personal error book. Actively participate in speech exercises and try to correct yourself. Increase openness to feedback by communicating in English outside of class.

Methodologically:

It is recommended to create a natural feedback environment in ESP lessons through interactive methods (role-playing, simulations of professional situations).

It will be useful for teachers to conduct training on feedback strategies.

It is advisable to create a corpus of professional errors for each ESP area and develop appropriate feedback models.

In conclusion, the correct selection and effective use of oral correction techniques is an important pedagogical skill for ESP teachers. It enlivens the language learning process, involves students in active communication, and forms the skills to effectively use English in the professional field.

References

1.   Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms.* Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(1), 37–66.

2.   Sheen, Y. (2010). *The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA.* Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 169–179.

3.   Ortikov, M. K. U. (2024). MEANS OF CONNECTING PIECES OF ARTISTIC TEXT. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, *4*(7), 178-183.

4.   Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing.* Routledge.

5. Nassaji, H. (2016). *Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis.* Language Teaching Research, 20(4), 535–562.

6. Yang, Y., & Lyster, R. (2010). *Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms.* Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 235–263.

7. Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). *Exploring teachers' oral corrective feedback practices in EFL classrooms: The role of individual and contextual factors.* System, 99, 102482.

8. Yuldasheva Z. The role of reflective approach and feedback in foreign language teaching. // Language and Literature Education, 2021, No. 3. – P. 27–33. (Yo'ldosheva Z. Chet tillar ta'limida reflektiv yondashuv va feedbackning roli. // Til va adabiyot ta'limi, 2021, №3. – B. 27–33).

9. Saidova F. Formation of communicative competence in professional English lessons. – Tashkent: TSUL Publishing House, 2022. – 120 p. (Saidova F. Professional ingliz tili darslarida kommunikativ kompetensiyani shakllantirish. – Toshkent: TDYU nashriyoti, 2022. – 120 b.)

10. Djampulatova, N. (2025). THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN COMPUTER LINGUISTICS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE. *Общественные науки в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования*, *4*(13), 9-11 (Djampulatova, N. (2025). KOMPYUTER TILSHUNOSLIGI VA SUN'IY INTELLEKTDA TILNING ROLI. *Общественные науки в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования*, *4*(13), 9-11.)

11. Abdullayeva, M. (2022). The Appearance Of The Term "Education Dictionary" In World Linguistics Is Analyzed. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, *2*(Special Issue 28-2), 48-52.

12. Abdullayeva, M., and M. Maxmudova. "Importance of legal education characteristics." *Science and Innovation* 1.7 (2022): 1311-1314.

13. Abdullayeva, M., & Bekmahammadova, F. (2025). INGLIZ TILINI O'RGANISHDA SUNIY INTELLEKTDAN FOYDALANISH. *Pedagogik islohotlar va ularning yechimlari*, *12*(01), 136-137.

14. MUZAFFAR XOJIMUROD O'G'LI ORTIQOV. (2024). ROLE OF VIRTUAL REALITY TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES . *TADQIQOTLAR.UZ*, *31*(2), 131–133. Retrieved from https://tadqiqotlar.uz/new/article/view/2042